

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 917

HE 004 785

AUTHOR Wolosin, Myrna A.
TITLE An Interview of Faculty Members and Their Involvement with the Honors Division.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., Bloomington. Bureau of Educational Studies and Testing.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 36p.; Indiana Studies in Prediction No. 23
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Faculty; *Higher Education; *Honors Classes; *Honors Curriculum; Question Answer Interviews; School Involvement; *Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Any program or division which does not have its own faculty must relay on the faculties of the schools and departments to provide quality education for its students. The Honors Division is in this category. Having no faculty of its own, the Honors Division must find methods of gaining support from the faculty and must encourage them to add a commitment to the Honors Division in terms of teaching, advising, etc., to their already heavy work loads. The purpose of this survey was to find out just how the Honors Division is perceived by faculty members, how the present honors program is evaluated, the extent of faculty involvement with the Honors Division, and how the faculty believe the Honors Division ought to be changing in the future. Fifty-one faculty members constituted the sample. The most startling data to emerge from the survey was the lack of knowledge and information about the honors program. The faculty varied greatly in their degree of commitment and willingness to support the honors program. More faculty members would be willing to teach for the Honors Division if other teaching loads were reduced and if there were greater rewards for teaching. The faculty believed that the Honors Division should be more innovative. The appendix contains the interview schedule. (Author/PG)

ED 083917

*An Interview Study of Faculty
Members and Their Involvement
with the Honors Division*

INDIANA STUDIES IN PREDICTION

NUMBER TWENTY-THREE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Bureau of Educational Studies and Testing
INDIANA UNIVERSITY / 1973

ED 083917

An Interview Study of Faculty Members and
Their Involvement with the Honors Division

by

Myrna A. Wolosin

Indiana Studies in Prediction No. 23

Bureau of Educational Studies and Testing
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana
1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Selection of the Sample	1
Procedure	4
Results	5
A. Objectives of the Honors Program	5
B. Faculty Commitment to the Honors Division	12
C. Faculty Assessment of Some Areas of Interaction between Honors Students and the Honors Division . . .	17
D. Implication for the Future	25
Conclusions	27
Appendix	29

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Noninvolved Sample	2
2. Involved Sample	3
3. Total Sample	3
4. Percent of Respondents Selecting Objectives for H. Series Courses Cross-Tabulated by Involvement with Those Courses	6
5. Objectives of Departmental Honors Courses Cross-Tabulated by Involvement in Departmental Honors Courses	8
6. Percent of Respondents Teaching Departmental Honors Courses Cross-Tabulated by Percentage Teaching Honors Level Courses or Seminars	9
7. Overall Objectives of the Honors Program (in Percentages) Cross-Tabulated by Involvement with Honors Courses or Seminars	10
8. Willingness To Support the Honors Program Cross-Tabulated by the Existence of a Departmental Honors Program	13
9. Degree of Commitment to the Honors Program as It Differs between Respondents in Departments with or without Upper Level Honors Programs	15
10. Extent to Which Departments Encourage Support of the Honors Program	16
11. Method of Selecting Students for the Honors Division .	18
12. Assessment of Distinctiveness of Honors Students' Needs Cross-Tabulated by Involvement in Departmental Honors Program	20
13. Satisfaction with the Current System of Advising Honors Students	23

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd.)

Table	Page
14. Specific Improvements That Could Be Made in the Advising System	24
15. Recognition of Discrepancies between the Honors Program as It Is and as It Ought To Be Cross- Tabulated by Involvement with the Program	25

An Interview Study of Faculty Members and Their Involvement with the Honors Division

Introduction

Any program or division which does not have its own faculty must rely on the faculties of the schools and departments to provide quality education for its students. The Honors Division is in this category. Having no faculty of its own, the Honors Division must find methods of gaining support from the faculty and must encourage them to add a commitment to the Honors Division in terms of teaching, advising, etc. to their already heavy work loads.

The purpose of this survey was to find out just how the Honors Division is perceived by faculty members, how the present honors program is evaluated, the extent of faculty involvement with the Honors Division, and how the faculty believe the Honors Division ought to be changing in the future.

Selection of the Sample

The sample of faculty to be interviewed was selected from three schools on the Bloomington campus: Arts and Sciences, Business, and Music. The size of the sample from each school was proportional to the size of the school, and faculty members to be interviewed were chosen randomly from lists supplied to the Bureau from each school. In addition to the random sample of faculty from each

Table 1. Noninvolved Sample

School	Total Population	Sample Size	Interviews Obtained
A & S	858	39	27 (8 involved with Honors)
Music	127	6	3 (1 involved)
Business	112	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>
		50	34

school, we solicited from the Honors Division lists of faculty members who had been involved in their program over the past 2½ years. From this group we also chose a sample to be interviewed. This process of selecting faculty members to be interviewed gave us two sample populations. One, the noninvolved sample, was selected randomly from total faculty population of each of the three schools mentioned above. The other, the involved sample, was selected from the Honors Division lists of faculty who had been assisting in their program. Interviewees on this list were also chosen randomly within each school. There was some overlap in the two populations as people in the noninvolved sample had been involved at some point in their careers at I.U. In the noninvolved sample 50 faculty members were

Table 2. Involved Sample

School	Total Population	Sample Size	Interviews Obtained
A & S	61	18	11
Music	4	1	0
Business	10	3	3
Other	6	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>
		25	17

selected for interviews and 34 interviews were obtained. In the involved sample, of the 25 people selected for interviews, seventeen were obtained. The rate of response for both categories was 68 percent.

Table 3. Total Sample

School	Total Population	Sample Size	Interviews Obtained
A & S	919	57	38
Music	131	7	3
Business	122	8	7
Other	6	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>
		75	51

Procedure

The interviewers hired by the bureau were three graduate students who had some experience in interviewing. All had previously been involved in a course which taught interviewing techniques and all had participated in a survey of students in the dormitories. In addition to their previous experience, the three interviewers underwent a two-hour training session. The interviewers were responsible for contacting their respondent and setting up appointments to meet with them. The interviewers were not aware of the status of their respondents on our involved-noninvolved dimension.

Prior to the interviewers contact, each faculty member in the sample received a copy of the questions to be asked and a request from the director of the Honors Division for cooperation. It was thought that by making the questions available prior to the interview the respondents would have the opportunity to begin to focus on the issues and to formulate answers. The interview time was intended as a summation of previous thinking rather than as time to think about the questions.

The interview schedule,* developed with the assistance of the Honors Division, consisted mainly of open-ended questions with some basic demographic data for identification purposes. Three general

*See Appendix A for interview schedule.

areas were covered in the interview: knowledge of the goals and objectives of the honors program, present involvement with the Honors Division and the extent of commitment to it, and interaction between the Honors Division and its students. The latter includes the selection of students, the process of advising them, and ways the Honors Division can meet their needs.

Results

The gross categories of involved, noninvolved populations that were used in sample selection were inappropriate for the analysis of our data. It became more relevant to know the specific extent of involvement, whether it be as a teacher, administrator, or adviser, and if that type of involvement was at all related to differences on other dimensions. Therefore, all the data that follow were analyzed with specific types of involvement with the Honors Division as cross-tabulated variables.

A. Objectives of the Honors Program

The most startling bit of data to emerge from our interviews was the surprising lack of knowledge and information about the honors program. The lack was not totally confined to those who had not been involved with the Honors Division but extended in some cases to those who had taught its courses and seminars. Table 4 indicates that a full 100 percent of those who had not taught honors courses or seminars had no idea about what the

Table A. Percent of Respondents Selecting Objectives for H. Series Courses Cross-Tabulated by Involvement with Those Courses

What do you see as the objectives of H. series courses?	Have Taught Honors Level Courses	Have Not Taught Honors Level Courses	Total
No answer	19.2	100.0	58.8 n=30
To challenge and stimulate bright students	30.3	0.0	15.7 n=8
To provide opportunity for independent work	3.8	0.0	2.0 n=1
To fully explore a field or an area in depth	26.9	0.0	13.7 n=7
To facilitate exchanges of ideas between students and faculty	11.5	0.0	5.9 n=3
To give students a feel for a particular field	3.8	0.0	2.0 n=1
Other	3.8	0.0	2.0 n=1
Total	51.0	49.0	
N	26	25	
			$\chi^2=34.33$
			$p < .001$

objectives of those courses should be. Close to 20 percent of those who had taught those courses were also unsure about their objectives. Of those faculty members who could state objectives for the courses, the most frequently mentioned objective was "to challenge and stimulate bright students" with "to explore a field in depth" a close second objective. It is interesting to note that the first of these objectives is extremely general and unrelated to a specific course, while the second objective is closely related to the discipline being studied.

It seems that there are two differing sets of expectations of honors courses, the first being that they are interesting, demanding and stimulating in and of themselves, and the second being that they adequately acquaint students with particular material in a discipline. Though during the interview sessions we probed for information, little was forthcoming on specific ways in which honors students could be challenged or stimulated in their seminars.

Many departments in the university provide their own upper-level honors work for students majoring in their disciplines. Thirty-nine of our faculty respondents were in departments with upper-level honors programs; nine were not and three did not know. Of the thirty-nine in departments which had upper-level programs, twenty-two had taught such courses and seventeen had not taught them. We were also interested in the objectives of these upper-level courses.

There were obvious differences in the assessment of objectives for department courses between those who had and those who had not taught such courses. Forty-one percent of those who had not taught departmental courses did not know what the objectives should be, while all of those who had taught answered the question. Only 13 percent of those not involved in departmental courses saw them as preparing students for future study. This contrasts with the 31 percent who saw preparation for graduate training as an important function of departmental honors work.

Table 5. Objectives of Departmental Honors Courses Cross-Tabulated by Involvement in Departmental Honors Courses

What do you think the objectives of a departmental honors program should be?	Have taught departmental honors courses	Have not taught departmental honors courses	Total	N
No answer or don't know	0.0	41.4	23.5	12
Individual attention and independent work	27.3	27.6	27.5	14
Preparation for graduate training	31.8	13.3	21.6	11
Develop specialized skills, interests, and abilities	36.4	6.9	19.6	10
Other	4.5	10.3	7.9	4
$\chi^2=20.12$				
$p<.001$				

It is interesting to contrast stated objectives of honors seminars and courses with the objectives of the departmental honors programs. In the departmental program a total of 27 percent of the respondents felt that a major objective should be to provide individual attention and independent work. This contrasts with the two percent who saw independent work as an objective of the H. series courses. The departments seem to see themselves as a training ground for the future; 21 percent of the respondents felt they should be preparing honors students for graduate training and another 19.6 percent felt their role was to develop special skills, interests, and abilities in these students.

These differences seem to be due to differing approaches to departmental and H series courses rather than to a difference in the

Table 6. Percent of Respondents Teaching Departmental Honors Courses Cross-Tabulated by Percentage Teaching Honors-Level Courses or Seminars

Have you taught any departmental honors courses?	Have Taught Honors Level Courses	Have Not Taught Honors Level Courses	Total	N
Yes	69.2	16.0	43.1	22
No	30.8	84.0	56.9	29
$\chi^2=12.63$				
$p<.001$				

people teaching them. In fact, it can be seen in Table 6 that there is a strong tendency for professors to be involved in both kinds of courses or in neither. Sixty-nine percent of the people who had taught honors level courses had also taught departmental courses, and 84 percent had taught neither. Only 16 percent of the respondents had not taught H level seminars but had taught honors level courses within their departments. The above data indicate that the variable needs of the Honors Division are being fulfilled by the same people whose roles vis a vis the honors program differ.

If we look at the faculty assessment of what the overall objectives of the honors program ought to be, we find that they are more

Table 7. Overall Objectives of the Honors Program (in Percentages)
Cross-Tabulated by Involvement with Honors Courses or Seminars

What do you think the overall objectives of the honors program ought to be?	Have Taught Honors Level Courses	Have Not Taught Honors Level Courses	Total	N
No answer	3.8	20.0	11.8	6
Individualized instruction	15.4	16.0	15.7	8
Flexible and special programs	15.4	12.0	13.7	7
Provide extra stimulation and challenge	57.7	24.0	41.2	21
Professional training, good preparation for grad. school	7.7	16.0	11.8	6
Other	0.0	12.0	5.9	3
$\chi^2=10.32$				
$p<.10$				

in line with the objectives of honors series courses than with the departmental honors courses. A total of 41.2 percent of the respondents saw the honors program existing to provide challenging and stimulating work for students. This was the most frequently chosen response category. Challenging work was not mentioned at all as an objective of departmental honors work (Table 5), while fifteen percent of the faculty interviewed saw the need for honors series courses to be challenging and stimulating (Table 4). The second overall objective mentioned by our faculty was the need for individualized instruction. This ties in closely with the third overall objective, the presence of flexibility in programs for students. In other words, the Honors Division ought to be able to increase the options available to its students and encourage the creation of programs and courses of study designed for the special needs of individual students. Only 11.8 percent of our total sample mentioned professional training or preparation for graduate school as an objective for the general honors programs. This is a less parochial view than that provided by the departments in stating objectives of departmental work. There (Table 5) 41.2 percent of the respondents want to prepare students for graduate training or develop their specialized skills. The departmental programs may lack an overview of the total function of the Honors Division and concentrate too closely on their own specialities.

It should be noted that in discussions with our interviewees several mentioned differing objectives for students who were majors

and those who were not. It is possible that the differences between departmental and general programs are reflecting this, with the departments involved more with majors in a field and seeing that they are adequately trained for specialization, while the general courses and seminars which deal with students who are both potential majors and nonmajors are more conscious of diversity of students and the need to be stimulating rather than specialized.

B. Faculty Commitment to the Honors Division

Our faculty respondents varied greatly in their degree of commitment and willingness to support the honors program. Some quite specifically expressed, along with a total lack of commitment, the belief that the Honors Division should not exist at all. Their reasons ranged from a concern that all students be permitted to experience the same "superior" education, now advocated only for honor students, to the fact that successful students should not be isolated, since in the average classroom they provide an extra measure of stimulation for other students. Seven of our 51 respondents made statements similar to these. They were in a clear minority.

Among those faculty who were more positive about the Honors Division there was still not an overwhelming interest in supporting the Honors Division. When asked "How much support do you feel you can give to the honors program?" a total of 21.6 of our respondents replied "none or very little," and 5.9 percent did not answer.

Table 8. Willingness To Support the Honors Program Cross-Tabulated by the Existence of a Departmental Honors Program

How much support do you feel you can give to the honors program?	Department has an upper level honors program	Department has no upper level honors program	Don't know	Total	N
None or very little	17.9	44.4	0.0	21.6	11
Teach (if other teaching loads reduced)	41.0	11.1	33.3	35.3	18
Counsel or direct students or work on theses	7.7	0.0	33.3	7.8	4
Administrative help	2.6	33.3	0.0	7.8	4
Variable amount-- according to what the program needs and what I can provide	25.6	11.1	0.0	21.6	11
No answer	5.1	0.0	33.3	5.9	3
$\chi^2=23.01$					
$p<.01$					

Thirty-five percent of the respondents said they would be willing to teach honors courses within their departments or at the lower levels, but half of those who responded affirmatively specified that they would do so only if their other teaching loads were reduced. The percent of faculty willing to go beyond just teaching honors students was quite small. Only 7.8 percent were willing to give the Honors Division administrative help, such as serving on committees, and another 7.8 percent were willing to advise and counsel

students and work with them on an individual basis. Many respondents stated that they could not say how much support they could provide for the Honors Division but that it would vary from semester to semester with their other demands and obligations.

With every type of support excepting one, administrative help, respondents in departments with upper-level honors programs were more willing to work for the Honors Division than those in departments without upper-level honors work. This can perhaps be understood in terms of each faculty member's personal options. For those in departments with upper-level programs teaching honors students can mean either 1) teaching advanced work to majors, teaching honors-level seminars most often to lower classmen, or 3) both. If a department has no upper-level program, the only alternative is to teach honors-level seminars. The faculty member in the department that has more opportunities available may find teaching honors students more attractive. The same may be true of counseling students and working with them on theses. If you are in a department with an upper-level program, working with students is limited to your own field and interests, while this may not be true if there are no upper-level honors students in your department.

The only place where existence of upper-level department programs does not affect options available to faculty is in the administrative area. And, in fact, here there are more faculty in departments without upper-level programs willing to give more administrative assistance than in departments with such programs, 33 percent compared to 2.6 percent.

In addition to a faculty member's willingness to support the Honors Division one must also consider his commitment to it in terms of his other activities, whatever they may be. In other words, where does the involvement with the Honors Division fit into each faculty member's personal list of priorities. More than 27 percent of the respondents, when asked to consider their commitment to the

Table 9. Degree of Commitment to the Honors Program as It Differs between Respondents in Departments with or without Upper Level Honors Programs

How strong is your commitment to the honors program in terms of your personal priorities?	Department has an upper level honors program	Department has no upper level honors program	Don't know	Total	N
Little or no commitment	23.1	55.6	0.0	27.5	14
Moderate commitment	35.9	11.1	0.0	29.4	15
Strong commitment	20.5	11.1	33.3	19.6	10
No more of a commit- ment than to teaching in general	15.4	0.0	33.3	13.7	7
Don't view it as part of my job	5.1	22.2	0.0	7.8	4
No answer	0.0	0.0	33.3	2.0	1
$\chi^2=27.91$					
$p<.01$					

Honors Division in terms of their personal priorities stated little or no commitment to it. Another seven percent did not view work with the Honors Division as part of their job. Several of these people also stated that as the rewards for teaching were minimal they preferred to spend their limited amount of time doing other, more rewarding, things. It was not clear whether they were responding to institutional or personal rewards. Another 13 percent had no more of a commitment to teaching honors students than they had to teaching in general. However, the majority of respondents, close to 51 percent, said they were moderately or strongly committed to the honors program, and working with the Honors Division was therefore a relatively high priority item.

Personal commitment to the Honors Division may be effected by departmental attitudes towards the Honors Division. That is,

Table 10. Extent to Which Departments Encourage Support of the Honors Program

Does your department encourage you to support the program?	Department has an upper level honors program	Department has no upper level honors program	Don't know	Total	N
Yes	53.8	11.1	33.3	45.1	23
No	15.1	66.7	0.0	23.5	12
No answer	2.6	0.0	66.7	5.9	3
Departmental program only	5.1	11.1	0.0	5.9	3
Neither encouragement nor discouragement	23.1	11.1	0.0	19.6	10
$\chi^2=33.88$					
$p<.001$					

department chairmen and colleagues may encourage or discourage faculty support. In departments that have upper-level honors programs 53 percent of the respondents felt that their departments encouraged them to support the program, 15 percent said they were not encouraged to support it, and 23 percent said their departments were relatively neutral; support for the Honors Division was neither encouraged nor discouraged. In departments without upper-level honors programs the responses are significantly ($p < .001$) different. Eleven percent of the respondents felt encouraged to support the Honors Division; 11 percent felt their departments were neutral; and more than two thirds of the respondents were not encouraged by their departments to support it at all. Perhaps this latter figure reflects a general departmental disinterest in the Honors Division.

C. Faculty Assessment of Some Areas of Interaction between Honors Students and the Honors Division

The first type of contact any student has with the Honors Division is through its method of selection of potential candidates for honors work. We were interested in finding out what the faculty thought criteria for such selection ought to be and whether they saw themselves as relevant to the selection process.

Table 11. Method of Selecting Students for the Honors Division

How do you think students ought to be selected for Honors Division work?	N	%
No answer	3	5.8
Test scores (College Boards, etc.)	4	7.8
Faculty recommendations	10	19.6
Grade-point average--major or overall	12	23.5
Internal characteristics--motivation, interest, enthusiasm	9	17.6
Self-selection--open to all who desire it	9	17.6
Other	4	7.8

The most frequently mentioned selection criterion was grade-point average, either in the student's major if he were only interested in upper-level departmental honors courses, or overall GPA. Thirty-three percent of the respondents felt this would be the best single indicator of ability to do honors work. Nineteen percent of the respondents thought faculty recommendations ought to be the basis for selecting students for the Honors Division. This could apply only to students who enter the Honors Division after at least one semester on campus. The respondents who selected this alternate felt that a personal knowledge of a student could take intangibles such as motivation or interest as well as ability into account.

Over 17 percent of the respondents believed that self-selection ought to be the way students entered the Honors Division. These respondents said that the division should be open to all who wanted to be a part of it and that students themselves are capable of determining their suitability. It was mentioned that the inevitable errors of selection that would be made could be easily detected both by students themselves and by faculty working with them. For these people it is important that all who are interested be given the opportunity to participate in the Honors Division.

Closely related to the idea of self-selection is the belief that students should be selected for the Honors Division on the basis of internal characteristics such as motivation and enthusiasm. The reasoning behind this was that though many students are intelligent enough to do the work only a few bring that extra measure of involvement to their work. It is these students for whom the Honors Division should exist. The major problem in using internal characteristics as a criterion for selection is finding a reliable instrument to assess such characteristics.

It was surprising that so few respondents, 7.8 percent, preferred using test scores such as the College Boards or the ACT as the criteria for selection, especially since there are data available on the ability of these tests to predict success in college. Though it is not reflected in Table 11, many respondents mentioned multiple criterion of selection. The most frequently mentioned

combination was the use of GPA's for students above the freshman year or College Boards for freshmen along with faculty recommendations.

Once the problem of selection of honors students has been dealt with, the Honors Division must ask itself how it can best serve its student clients. An answer to this question must revolve around a determination of what their special needs are, if any, and how they can best be met.

We asked faculty respondents about the special needs of honors students as distinguished from the needs of students in general.

Table 12. Assessment of Distinctiveness of Honors Students' Needs Cross-Tabulated by Involvement in Departmental Honors Program

In what way, if any, are the needs of honors students distinctive?	Have taught departmental honors courses	Have not taught departmental honors courses	Total	N
No answer	0.0	10.3	5.9	3
Their needs are not distinctive, no different	18.2	17.2	17.6	9
They need more challenge and higher standards	40.9	13.8	25.5	13
They need more independence	4.5	20.7	13.7	7
They need more flexible programs	9.1	24.1	17.6	9
They need more individual attention	18.2	10.3	13.7	7
Other	9.1	3.4	5.9	3
$\chi^2=11.10$				
$p<.10$				

The most prevalent response (over 40 percent) among those who had taught departmental honors work was that honors students, because of their high ability, must be challenged more by the work they do-- in other words, they must be helped to use their full capacities by being required to do so. Setting higher standards for them was seen as a part of this challenge. Those who had not taught honors work saw honors students as needing more flexibility in programs available to them. Among those who had taught departmental honors courses, the second largest response categories, 18.2 percent each, were 1) that honors students need more individual attention and 2) that their needs are not at all distinctive from the needs of other students. Those respondents who had not taught departmental honors courses were much more likely to see honors students as needing more independence, 20.7 percent, compared to 4.5 percent. It is unclear if the cause of this discrepancy is due to a misinterpretation of how much independence honors students already have or about how much independence honors students need. Seventeen percent of those who had not taught departmental courses also believed that the needs of honors students were no different from the needs of other students. This is quite comparable to the percent of respondents who had taught departmental courses and felt the same way.

Along with the assessment of student needs, we asked specifically how the faculty thought the Honors Division could help meet those needs. Thirteen percent of the respondents could not answer the question, and another four percent responded in ways that were not

codable. The largest percentage of respondents, 29.4 percent, thought the Honors Division could assist its students by providing special courses for them with fewer students in each course and more independent work required. Over 17 percent thought the most helpful thing the Honors Division could provide was flexibility in working out programs and thereby broaden a student's experiences while in school.

Better faculty-student relations were mentioned by close to 10 percent and another 11.7 percent mentioned that the Honors Division could provide more and better counseling and advising for its students. A small number of faculty members also mentioned that there should be more money available for students who wish to do honors work. Another small percentage, 5.8, felt that the Honors Division should be responsible for an earlier and more accurate identification of honors students.

Of our sample of 51 respondents, 21 had been or currently were advisers for honors students. It is interesting to note that when asked if the system of advising students was satisfactory, a total

Table 13. Satisfaction with the Current System of Advising Honors Students

Do you think the current system of advising students is satisfactory?	Have been an honors adviser	Have not been an honors adviser	Total	N
Yes	38.1	3.3	17.6	9
No	14.3	6.7	9.8	5
Don't know	19.0	90.0	60.8	31
Other	28.6	0.0	11.8	6
$\chi^2=27.99$				
$p<.001$				

of 60.8 percent did not know, and this figure includes 19 percent of those who themselves had been advisers and still could make no judgement of the success of the advising system. This suggests that advisers get little feedback from the students themselves or from the Honors Division about how well they are doing their jobs. A total of 17.6 percent saw the advising system as satisfactory and 9.8 percent said that it was not satisfactory.

When asked how the system of advising students could be improved, several specific suggestions were made, most of those coming from people who had been advisers. Of those who had not been advisers

Table 14. Specific Improvements That Could Be Made in the Advising System

How could the system of advising be improved?	Have been an honors adviser	Have not been an honors adviser	Total	N
No answer or don't know	38.1	93.3	70.6	36
Fewer students per adviser	4.8	0.0	2.0	1
Advise only students in your own field	4.8	0.0	2.0	1
Use professional advisers	23.6	6.7	13.7	7
More formal system	19.0	0.0	7.8	4
Other	9.5	0.0	3.9	2
$\chi^2=19.41$				
$p<.01$				

93 percent gave no answer or did not know. Thirty-eight percent of those who had been advisers also did not know. Over 23 percent suggested that the advisers used by the Honors Division should be professional advisers specifically trained to do this job and not having other responsibilities that were of a higher priority. Nineteen percent thought the advising system was too informal with many students not even aware of who their advisers were or the role they could play. They suggested formalizing the system and making it easier to ask the assistance of an adviser. Two other suggestions

were made: 1) to advise only students in one's own field and 2) to give fewer students to each adviser. The latter does not seem to be a real problem as advisers seem to be under rather than over used.

D. Implication for the Future

Respondents were asked if they saw any discrepancies between the way the honors program is and the way they thought it ought to be.

Table 15. Recognition of Discrepancies between the Honors Program as It Is and as It Ought To Be Cross-Tabulated by Involvement with the Program

Do you see any major discrepancies between the way the honors program is and the way you think it ought to be?	Have Taught Honors Level Courses	Have Not Taught Honors Level Courses	Total	N
Yes	42.3	8.0	25.5	13
No	34.6	36.0	35.3	18
Don't know	23.1	56.0	39.2	20
$\chi^2=9.41$				
$p<.01$				

The largest proportion of respondents did not know. Those who had taught honors courses were more likely to see the discrepancies than those who had not been involved at all, 42 percent compared to 8 percent. Roughly the same percentage of respondents in both involved and noninvolved categories did not see such discrepancies.

When we probed further to find out what those discrepancies were, 29 people did not answer and another 10 responded inappropriately. Four respondents mentioned that students with the potential for honors work were not identified early enough; four others mentioned that the Honors Division should be more selective in choosing both students and faculty to participate in the Honors Division. Three respondents mentioned that the University's commitment to the honors program should be more evident in providing funds for its use; and one faculty member said the honors courses were remiss in their grading practices, with there being little correspondence between quality of work and grades received.

Our final question was to ask respondents if they could see any direction in which the honors program ought to be moving. Twenty-seven percent did not know and four percent gave miscellaneous responses. Seventeen percent of the respondents said the Honors Division ought to be more involved in innovative and experimental ways of teaching students. Some specifically mentioned field work and other out-of-the-classroom activities. Another 15 percent thought that the honors program should have more interdisciplinary work, and that the traditional departmental courses of study were inadequate to meet the diverse interests and needs of many of today's students. They said that departmental programs were often artificial ways of parceling out material and that there were currently many obstacles to interdepartmental studies.

Another group of respondents, 11.7 percent, cited the need for better communication and cooperation between the Honors Division and other people who are relevant to the work of honors students.

Nearly eight percent of the respondents saw a need for the honors program to work at broadening its bases and promoting the same options now available only for honors students for all students in the University. These people wanted to remove a false sense of eliteness from the Honors Division. Another eight percent felt that part of the Honors Division's inability to serve more students was closely connected to a lack of financing and suggested that the Honors Division work at getting more funds allocated to it.

A very small percent of respondents said that the honors program ought to try and find better methods of selecting students and an equally small number, 3.9 percent, said there should be an effort to obtain higher quality teaching. These latter categories seem to indicate that faculty members are for the most part satisfied both with the students recruited and the faculty who are teaching them.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are supported by this study.

1. There is a lack of information about the Honors Division and its programs on this campus.
2. There is among faculty a dual set of expectations about the function of honors courses.

3. There is a strong tendency for faculty who are involved with the Honors Division to teach both upper-level and H. series courses.

4. More faculty members would be willing to teach for the Honors Division if a) other teaching loads were reduced and b) if there were greater rewards for teaching.

5. Departments can be effective in encouraging or discouraging support for the Honors Division.

6. Over one-third of the faculty interviewed felt GPA should be the best indicator of ability to do honors work.

7. Faculty members feel that honors students need greater challenge and higher standards set for them.

8. There is a lack of knowledge among faculty members about the mechanism for advising honors students.

9. The faculty believes that the Honors Division should be more innovative.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Interviewer	Name
Date	School
Length of Interview	Department

1. Have you taught any honors level courses or seminars?

yes no (circle one)

If yes, go on to #2. If no, skip to #3.

2. What do you see as the objectives of H. series courses (H100-H400)?

3. Does your department have an upper-level honors program?

yes no don't know (circle one)

If no, skip to #6.

4. Have you taught departmental honors courses?

yes no (circle one)

5. What do you think the objectives of a departmental honors program should be?

6. Have you been an adviser for honors students?

yes no (circle one)

If no, skip to #8.

7. Do you think the current system of advising students is satisfactory?

7a. How could that system be improved?

8. How strong is your commitment to the honors program in terms of your other personal priorities? (PROBE--where does it fit with your other commitments? Demands on your time?)

9. How much support do you feel you can give to the honors program?

9a. Does your department, i.e., chairman or colleagues, encourage you to support the program?

10. In what way, if any, are the needs of honors students distinctive?

11. How can the Honors Division help meet their needs?

12. Can you see any directions that the program ought to be moving in?

13. What do you think the overall objectives of the honors program ought to be?

14. How do you think students ought to be selected for honors work?

15. Do you see any major discrepancies between the way the honors program is and the way you think it ought to be?

yes no don't know (circle one)

If yes, go on to #16.

16. What are those discrepancies?